

Have Your Afternoon Tea
on the Terrace
of Jerusalem's
King David Hotel
*surrounded by its beautiful
gardens.*
(Tea or Coffee and 2 Cakes
IL.4.000 all inclusive).

Russia Threatens to Use Force If Poland Drops Rokossovsky

Soviet Pressure Said Repulsed

WARSAW, Sunday.— Polish sources said here to night that the Soviet Communist Party chief, Mr. Nikita Khrushchev, threatened to bring in Russian troops if the Polish Communist Party dropped Defence Minister Marshal Konstantin Rokossovsky from its Politbureau.

Mr. Khrushchev and three other Soviet leaders arrived in Warsaw suddenly for a blitz visit yesterday while the Central Committee of the Polish Communist Party was meeting to elect a new Politbureau, the ruling group. They returned to Moscow today.

According to reports here the new Politbureau is to have included neither Mar-

the was-tillie Polish Government in London.

Reports from Warsaw itself said the capital was calm. There was no evidence of extraordinary security precautions.

Reports of Russian troop movements toward Warsaw were contradictory last night. Some reports suggested such movements, from East Germany, there was no official confirmation, and a Reuters

born Russian general, nor other men believed to be against "democratization" of

The Polish state.
Other Polish sources said, however, that the Russians were "repulsed" when they came to dictate to the Poles as to what should sit on the Polish cabinet.
They said that the invited guests were not allowed to attend the plenary session. Instead adjourned and appointed a delegation to talk to them. Other reports in the swift-moving Russo-Polish crisis said that:

Gomulka Leads Party

The Polish Liberal leader, Mr. Wladyslaw Gomulka, former secretary of the first Communist Party expelled for Titoist tendencies in 1951, has been reinstated and is now leading the movement replacing First Secretary Edward Ochab. (This was announced at a mass meeting

town about 80 kms. from the Polish capital, but apparently heading westward away from Warsaw.)
Soviet Army trucks on road between Lodz and Poznan, which was heading towards the capital.

Report Tanks Moving

(In Paris) The evening newspaper Le Monde claimed in a report from Warsaw that despite what had appeared to be agreement between Soviet and Polish leaders, Soviet troops and 800 tanks were moving to Poland's border.
The paper's special correspondent in Warsaw said that confusion in Poland was extremely widespread.
Mr. Khrushchev, accompanied by Messrs. V.M. Molotov and Anastas Mikoyan, left Leningrad Saturday night for L'azarskiy, arrived via

Mr. Stern Staszewski, alternate member of the Central Committee, who added that the formal elections

U.S. Spies' to Face Trial in Prague

PRAGUE, Saturday (Reuter). — Czechoslovak authorities are preparing to try before court here in 1947. He was Premier of

seven members of an American spy team would shortly be brought to trial in Czechoslovakia.

The Czechoslovak news agency, CETEKA, said leaders of the group were two top-level defectors who were allegedly trained at an espionage school at Frankfurt in West Germany and sent to Czechoslovakia by U.S. authorities "equipped with machine-guns, grenades, pistols and American-made radio transmitters."

Namir Leaves For Yugoslavia

LYDDA AIRPORT, Saturday.—The Minister of Labour, Mr. Mordechai Namir, left yesterday by T.W.A. with Knesset Members Admonai Ben-Ner and Herta Berger to represent the Knesset on an official 10-day visit to Yugoslavia. Two other members of the delegation left two days earlier.

The delegation was accompanied to the airport by the newly-appointed Yugoslav Minister of Foreign Affairs, The Knesset Speaker, Mr. Yocef Sprinzak, and several Knesset Members were among the guests who accompanied them for the delegation at the home

He said "numerous reports have been emanating from Poland, which is in a state of tension and unrest," and "these are accompanied by a series of Soviet troop movements."

Mr. Eisenhower added in a statement through his Press Secretary that he was "reminded of the talks with Secretary of State Dulles 'in an effort to ascertain the facts.'"

Bulgarian Offers Like Accord to End A-Tests

MOSCOW, Saturday (Reuters).—Premier Nikolai Bulganin has proposed in a letter to President Eisenhower an immediate agreement to ban the U.S. and Russia to ban atomic weapon testing.

TASS announced tonight.

In the letter, handed over in Washington yesterday, Marshal Bulganin said the agreement would "of course apply to other states which had atomic weapons."

Greece May Leave

Council of Europe
STRAZBURG, Aug. 14 (U.P.)—Greece's Minister of State, Mr. Gregoire Cassimatis, said here today that Greece was not disappointed that the 16-nation Council of Europe had done "nothing about the Cyprus question" and might leave the Council.

He told the press after a speech in the Council's Consultative Assembly, in which he criticized the Council's work.

"I wanted to warn the Assembly that we might be leaving the Council of Europe if we are dissatisfied with the Council's work and disappointed that it has done nothing about the Cyprus question," he said.

Asked why Greece might take this step, Mr. Cassimatis said, "We don't want to make a hasty decision."

Dead-tired and the wash-bowls still in the sink, I nearly forgot to use Tamin! Remembering who let Tamin do the heavy mucking, I'm sure I shall be happy and never tired.



THE JERUSALEM POST

Founded in 1921. Published daily except on Saturdays and Jewish Holy Days. Registered at the G.P.O.

Founder: GERSHON AGRON
Managing Editor: TED R. LURIE

Editorial Office and Management: JERUSALEM: 9 Habrasat, P.O.B. 11, Tel. 421 (4 lines).
TEL AVIV Bureau: 28 Nahlat Binyamin, P.O.B. 1128, Tel. 421/2.
HAIFA Bureau: 1 Rehov Knapot, P.O.B. 98, Tel. 4094 (3 lines).
Subscriptions: Israel 12.000, Foreign 14.000 per year.

Sunday, October 13, 1956
35 Nechman, 2717-28 Avod, 1976

THE key to the present strained situation between Poland and the Soviet Union may be found in the vitriolic attack by AND POLAND: Pravda

on the Polish press, although a great deal of the emphasis and venom employed there may be discounted as extra heavy artillery designed to indicate that the Soviets really mean business.

The sudden incursion of the top Soviet leadership into the meeting of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers Party, on Friday, was not just a move against Mr. Gomulka, whose reinstatement has now gone all the way with his reported appointment as First Secretary of the Polish Communist Party.

For Mr. Gomulka, on his record as a faithful left-wing Socialist, is not likely to open the gates of Poland to those fascist and reactionary elements which seem to worry the Soviets so much. What is possible, however, is that he might, as one of the principal victims of Stalinism in Poland — he was imprisoned in 1951 and held for four years without trial — show his reaction against Stalinism to go too far. This would not be difficult as the tide of democratization and liberalization in Poland appears to be at its fullest flow.

The tempo is too fast to be comfortable for Moscow and especially for Mr. Khrushchev, who has lately been rushing backwards and forwards throughout the Communist world in an endeavour to put a cautious brake on the forces he unleashed at the historic Twentieth Party Congress.

The situation in Poland is complicated and made more dangerous by the fact that there still appear to be fascist elements in that country which have never been entirely suppressed. If they have jumped onto the liberalization bandwagon, it can only be in an attempt to gain a strategic position which might weaken Poland's allegiance to the Communist bloc.

The fears which the Soviets have may be summarized very simply: Poland now wishes to claim the same status as Yugoslavia under Tito. But there is a vast difference between the importance to Russia of Yugoslavia and of Poland. The former was important as an entry to the Mediterranean; which the Soviets subsequently achieved through their support of Egypt and the Arab states. This is not nearly as vital to Russia as its permanent need for a friendly Poland on her Western frontier. Without this her entire position in East Germany must collapse, and she becomes as vulnerable as she was in 1939. For that reason alone the Soviets do not want Mr. Gomulka, or whoever survives in the present shake-up of Polish leadership, to do anything like a Tito on them.

To maintain Poland inside the Soviet bloc, without any large reservations, there is little doubt that Moscow will not hesitate to use force. The Soviet tank moving towards Warsaw may not be confirmed. But that such action will be taken if necessary is clear. Nor will Moscow be moved from her purpose by the indignation such military coercion of Poland would arouse throughout the world, and especially in Asia, or by the effect it would have on her other satellites.

Indeed a show of force towards Poland now, especially since the justification, from Moscow's viewpoint, is spelled out by these overriding considerations, may serve notice on the other satellite countries in no uncertain terms that the new post-Stalin liberalization must proceed only at the pace and to the limits that Moscow lays down. The latest reports of the defection of thousands of Hungarian students from the local Communist party is only one more indication that such warnings to the other satellite countries are, from the Moscow point of view, very timely.

Diplomatic Activity and Journeys Cover Deep-Seated Unrest Troubles of Khrushchev

By EDWARD CRANKSHAW

LONDON (O.F.N.S.)—

WHAT is happening to Mr. Nikita Khrushchev? A year ago he was having things all his own way. Active opposition on the highest level to his leadership policy was confined to Mr. Vyacheslav Molotov, who had been driven into total isolation in the matter of the Kremlin's apology to Marshal Tito. Even the veteran Stalinist Mr. Lazar Kaganovich, seemed prepared to string along with Khrushchev. The excursion to India and Burma was a resounding triumph, and a warning to Mao Tse-tung. The way seemed to lie open to ever-deeper Soviet penetration of Asia and the Middle East under the general heading of "competitive coexistence."

Then came the critical and historical Party Congress in February of this year, which Khrushchev, as the result of which he was able to strengthen his position very greatly in the country by placing his nominees in key positions in the Party apparatus. Khrushchev was still far from being a dictator, but he had accumulated immense personal power. Although when the first news of the de-Stalinization leaked out the obvious deduction was that Khrushchev had been forced to place his nominees in key positions in the Party apparatus, Khrushchev was still far from being a dictator, but he had accumulated immense personal power.

Obvious Setback
The first obvious setback to Khrushchev's rise was the Bulgarian, to Britain last April, and his quarrel with the leaders of the British Labour Party. After all, Mr. George Lansbury, the trail blazer, had made a spectacular success of his own public appearance in Britain; and Khrushchev was seen to have been a great deal on winning the confidence of Western Socialists as a means of spreading Communism by Parliamentary methods. The row at the Labour Party dinner in Westminster paid to that particular dream.

Then other things began to happen. When the United States State Department's text of the Khrushchev denunciation of Stalin was published, it produced a variety of results in foreign Communist parties which were certainly not desired. The Poles took the bit between their teeth and started to bolt, but it produced one sort of difficulty. And this process, leading to the Poznan riots at the end of June, must have given the opposition in the Kremlin a

heaven-sent opportunity to say "We told you so!" The Communist parties in a number of Western countries were temporarily wild. But even more seriously, from Khrushchev's personal point of view, other satellite leaders — notably the Bulgarians — showed an extreme reluctance to do anything, all about de-Stalinization. And this can have only meant one thing: they had reason to believe that Khrushchev's day was numbered, and were thus reluctant to jump onto his particular bandwagon.

Back-Pedalling
Already, immediately after Poznan, there were signs that Khrushchev was having to work very hard to keep his secretary and at the same time to do some back-pedalling. It was apparent that Molotov was no longer isolated, that Kaganovich was slowly making his way back into the limelight, and that Khrushchev was still far from being a dictator, but he had accumulated immense personal power. Although when the first news of the de-Stalinization leaked out the obvious deduction was that Khrushchev had been forced to place his nominees in key positions in the Party apparatus, Khrushchev was still far from being a dictator, but he had accumulated immense personal power.

is that Khrushchev told this that unless he was prepared to make some concessions to the concept of a Soviet bloc (which Tito has always vigorously opposed) then he could not be answerable for the consequences — to East Europe and to Tito. He seems to have got nowhere with this.

Failed in Russia
Whether he has also failed in Russia still remains to be seen. We shall know more perhaps after the imminent plenum of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party. But of one thing we can be sure after the rendering of the Yalta meeting, from which the major part of the Soviet leadership ostentatiously stayed away; and that is that Khrushchev's own policy is not what it was. Whether the main issue between Khrushchev and his colleagues is really a policy issue, or is one of the most fundamental of policy issues, is an attempt to put down a man who has shown signs of wrecking the collective understanding of the pursuit of his own personal interest is another question — to which the answer may be slow in coming.

Inside Russia, Khrushchev, throughout the summer, was ceaselessly active. He moved from city to city, from province to province, making speeches everywhere he went and showing himself to the people on a scale unheard of since the Revolution. On the face of it he was bringing the Government to the people. But it looked rather as though what he was trying to do was to popularize himself, in an attempt to appeal to the country over the heads of his colleagues. He was actively engaged in this when the Poznan riots broke out and Khrushchev and Marshal Zhukov descended on Poland, and for the first time found a satellite government prepared to resist their demands.

Tito an Ally
During all this time Khrushchev's greatest ally seemed to be Marshal Tito, who, to all appearances, was attacking the Soviet line in order not to give the Stalinist faction in the Kremlin any handle for an attack on Khrushchev. But in the end, things seemed to have gone too far even for Tito to stomach. The famous "secret circular" from the Soviet Communist Party warning the satellite parties to be on their guard against Tito seems to have been the last straw. And if one can guess at all what happened, first at Brioni, then at Yalta, it

was that Khrushchev told Tito that unless he was prepared to make some concessions to the concept of a Soviet bloc (which Tito has always vigorously opposed) then he could not be answerable for the consequences — to East Europe and to Tito. He seems to have got nowhere with this.

heaven-sent opportunity to say "We told you so!" The Communist parties in a number of Western countries were temporarily wild. But even more seriously, from Khrushchev's personal point of view, other satellite leaders — notably the Bulgarians — showed an extreme reluctance to do anything, all about de-Stalinization. And this can have only meant one thing: they had reason to believe that Khrushchev's day was numbered, and were thus reluctant to jump onto his particular bandwagon.

Back-Pedalling
Already, immediately after Poznan, there were signs that Khrushchev was having to work very hard to keep his secretary and at the same time to do some back-pedalling. It was apparent that Molotov was no longer isolated, that Kaganovich was slowly making his way back into the limelight, and that Khrushchev was still far from being a dictator, but he had accumulated immense personal power.

Obvious Setback
The first obvious setback to Khrushchev's rise was the Bulgarian, to Britain last April, and his quarrel with the leaders of the British Labour Party. After all, Mr. George Lansbury, the trail blazer, had made a spectacular success of his own public appearance in Britain; and Khrushchev was seen to have been a great deal on winning the confidence of Western Socialists as a means of spreading Communism by Parliamentary methods. The row at the Labour Party dinner in Westminster paid to that particular dream.

Then other things began to happen. When the United States State Department's text of the Khrushchev denunciation of Stalin was published, it produced a variety of results in foreign Communist parties which were certainly not desired. The Poles took the bit between their teeth and started to bolt, but it produced one sort of difficulty. And this process, leading to the Poznan riots at the end of June, must have given the opposition in the Kremlin a

heaven-sent opportunity to say "We told you so!" The Communist parties in a number of Western countries were temporarily wild. But even more seriously, from Khrushchev's personal point of view, other satellite leaders — notably the Bulgarians — showed an extreme reluctance to do anything, all about de-Stalinization. And this can have only meant one thing: they had reason to believe that Khrushchev's day was numbered, and were thus reluctant to jump onto his particular bandwagon.

Friday's Press Security Council Debate

FOREIGN policy continues to hold its sway on editorial comment, emphasis being shifted from the Knesset to the Security Council. Al Hamshahar (Mapam) points out that the S.C. debate is not only important to us and to our foreign policy, but will also considerably influence public opinion the world over. Israel can under no circumstances accept the U.N. Secretary-General's interpretation of the cease-fire, but must insist on her elementary right of self-defence by any and all means — particularly as the U.N. has failed to safeguard peace on the border. But we should not forget that we have to overcome many misunderstandings on this issue abroad, and we should take the problem of public relations into consideration, when planning our defence actions.

Haaretz (World Mirror) is rather sceptical as to the results of the S.C. debate, in view of the prevailing trend of not distinguishing between attackers and defenders. Nevertheless Israel must continue her struggle for the recognition of her right of self-defence.

Haabek (General Zionist) also tackles the problem of public relations which according to the paper has been neglected by the Government. Haabek criticizes the Foreign Office for not forestalling the Jordanian move by an earlier appeal to the S.C. against the Jordanian outrage which preceded the Kalkiya action.

The way the situation was handled, Israel once more appears as the black sheep of the international community, the paper asserts, quoting the thoroughly unfriendly questions at Mr. Dulles' recent press conference.

Haaretz (World Mirror) also feels that Israel should have brought her complaint against Jordan to the Security Council at an earlier stage. The paper agrees with Mr. Ben-Gurion's distinction between the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization and the United Nations in general. Sanctions against Israel, if imposed by the Security Council, would be a blatant example of discrimination.

Haaretz says that it is not Israel but Soviet anti-Israel propaganda which "plays with fire." Soviet claims that the Israeli retaliatory actions are sponsored by the West, and are provocations against the Jews, are coloured by the Communist's who are increasingly beginning to occupy a chimerical Laputan island of their own, with little contact with Israel reality. There is ample evidence that the Kremlin rulers know the truth about the Arab outrage, but do not permit it to be publicized, out of fear that it might sympathize with Israel. The Soviet press and radio publish exclusively the Arab version of the incidents.

Lamshah (Abud Ha'avoda) warns that the ordeal is still ahead. The focus of danger now is Jordan. From an Israeli point of view the threat of Egypt's domination of Jordan with the help of Soviet arms is no less dangerous than the appearance of Western-supplied Iraqi forces on our borders.

Haaretz hopes that to-day's elections in Jordan will result in a majority in favour of the abolition of the British-Jordan defence treaty. The fear of British intervention has so far been the main obstacle for the liberation of historic Eretz Israel. Israel should enter the vacuum created between the expulsion of the British and the ascendency of other forces in their place, Haaretz urges.

The same paper demands the resignation of the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence, Mr. D. Ben-Gurion. This "dictatorial maniac" has Jordan defence treaty, the outbreak against Herut in Wednesday's Knesset meeting, that he is not fit to stand at the nation's helm at this fateful juncture. Haaretz has asked for an apology, but this is not a question of the personal honour of Mr. M. Begin, who is above the fray, but of the honour of the State.

Haaretz (non-party) once more urges the Minister of Finance, Mr. L. Eshkol, to accelerate the proposed income-tax reform in favour of the middle strata.

Yours, etc.
BARON FRANK
Von BLOMBERG
Jerusalem, October 14.

DEFENCE FUND MUSHROOMS
Editor, The Jerusalem Post
Sir, — In your issue of October 12, there is an item about my contributing the income of a crop of mushrooms to the Defence Fund. There is in part a gross inaccuracy in that item.

I am described as "red-cheeked, forthright, dynamic," etc. I consider it libellous and offensive to the dignity of my biblical three scores and ten. It is adding insult to injury. The fact is that I am "grey, wrinkled, quareloose, wrinkled-faced, white-haired man of seventy. I demand an immediate and unequivocal retraction or else."

Furthermore, my name is not Karnon, but Indignantly yours,
ISRAEL CRANON
Neveh Han, October 14.

IRISH NATIONALS
Editor, The Jerusalem Post
Sir, — I have just returned from a visit to Ireland. I have been asked to ascertain the names and addresses of Irish nationalists at present in Israel. May I, therefore, through the courtesy of your newspaper, invite residents, temporary or otherwise, to contact me immediately? My address is Rehov Hadekalim, Pardes Hanna.

Yours, etc.
J.S. STEINBERG
Pardes Hanna, October 15.

Raincoats
Excellent
Cleaned & Waterproofed
OMEGA-ASTA
43 GULIA ST. TEL. 43-1111

Concert at the "Y"
TUESDAY Night's Concert
At the "Y" was a thoroughly enjoyable experience. The orchestra under Georg Singer was in good form and gave a remarkably smooth performance of Mendelssohn's "Beautiful Melusina." Matyas Seiber's "Pastorale and Burlesque" for flute and strings was useful as an antidote to the predominantly romantic programme. It is a well-written, pleasant piece of modern music, which received appropriate treatment from Hanchel Tel-Oran. The Schumann Concerto stood out in all its beauty and splendour through the perfect interpretation and performance of Faina Savman who proved again that she is of international level. Congratulations to Kol Yisrael for having this artist the opportunity to appear with the orchestra before the Israel public, as the IPO seems to be concerned with the import of artists from abroad only. Miss Savman's playing was so beautiful that one must forgive her for the tendency to over-romanticize in parts.

Another bouquet to Kol Yisrael for having at long last found a way to put the instrument in front of the orchestra so that the audience can now really enjoy the pianist's performance. The evening closed with a vivid interpretation of Schubert's Third Symphony, overflowing with melodies, which received loving and spirited direction from Georg Singer.

Now is the time for
RAI-NO
FERTILIZER
The tested Plant Food which contains all organic-chemical essentials for plant growth and soil improvement.

Available at your dealer or at our branches:
HAIFA — 36 Nechman Road
TEL AVIV — 30 Rehov Tshlenov
TIBERIAS — Alara Building

Israel for ORCHARDS LAWNS FLOWERS VEGETABLES
HAISPAKA LTD.
OVAL — ROUND
20 CIGARETTES 250 PRUTA

Parliamentary Report Knesset Talks of War

By Lea Ben Dor

MR. Ben-Gurion said last Monday, when he opened the Foreign Affairs and Security Debates, that he believed that the nation was substantially united. Everybody, except perhaps the Communists, sought security, he said, claiming that punishment rarely changed a person, and never a nation. But how would he have reacted had anyone attacked him in the past two days later, and in which the General Zionists so conspicuously allied themselves with the Prime Minister's security policy. The debate was sober and substantial, and for once the members appeared to be genuinely talking to each other, and not solely to the gallery — though they had a good audience there throughout the three sessions.

Much of the talk throughout the debate — apart from the speech of the Prime Minister himself, was coloured by the aftermath of the Kalkiya attack. A day or so after this fight the entire Israeli press, again with the exception of the Communists, who are increasingly beginning to occupy a chimerical Laputan island of their own, with little contact with Israel reality, discussed the difficulties of the Kalkiya action with what was plainly well-founded information and total unanimity of view, from right to left. In essence the criticism was that Israel's retaliatory action had become routine, and therefore easier for the Jordanians to ward off, or at least to exact a greater cost in Israeli lives, and that it was not possible to fight retaliatory actions while observing tactical regulations and restrictions more appropriate to war games. Some realization of these facts had earlier begun to make itself felt, but it had never been given such outspoken form.

Even on this occasion there were some observers who doubted the wisdom of discussing military difficulties in plain view of the Egyptian and Jordan General Staffs, so to speak, or who thought that if it was time to air these matters, which are hardly subjects on which the general public can form a useful opinion, then they should have come formally from the Minister of Defence, rather than as a sudden and unanimous inspiration of the Press.

Retaliatory Action
Mr. Begin made the most of this criticism of the present form of retaliatory action, to judge by the supreme contempt with which he blamed the present governmental policies for their errors. One might have thought that Herut alone had recognized the problem, and not that the newspapers of all the Coalition parties had said the same and more. Mr. Bernstein of the General Zionists brought it up again, and so did Mr. Argov, of Mafsi itself. Where retaliation was being so much reviled as costly and not capable of stopping infiltrations in

Arab countries where lives are not held over death, only Mr. Galili, the Abud Ha'avoda leader, contrived to bring back a sense of proportion. Mr. Begin had wanted against punitive actions, he said, claiming that punishment rarely changed a person, and never a nation. But how would he have reacted had anyone attacked him in the past two days later, and in which the General Zionists so conspicuously allied themselves with the Prime Minister's security policy. The debate was sober and substantial, and for once the members appeared to be genuinely talking to each other, and not solely to the gallery — though they had a good audience there throughout the three sessions.

Much of the talk throughout the debate — apart from the speech of the Prime Minister himself, was coloured by the aftermath of the Kalkiya attack. A day or so after this fight the entire Israeli press, again with the exception of the Communists, who are increasingly beginning to occupy a chimerical Laputan island of their own, with little contact with Israel reality, discussed the difficulties of the Kalkiya action with what was plainly well-founded information and total unanimity of view, from right to left. In essence the criticism was that Israel's retaliatory action had become routine, and therefore easier for the Jordanians to ward off, or at least to exact a greater cost in Israeli lives, and that it was not possible to fight retaliatory actions while observing tactical regulations and restrictions more appropriate to war games. Some realization of these facts had earlier begun to make itself felt, but it had never been given such outspoken form.

Even on this occasion there were some observers who doubted the wisdom of discussing military difficulties in plain view of the Egyptian and Jordan General Staffs, so to speak, or who thought that if it was time to air these matters, which are hardly subjects on which the general public can form a useful opinion, then they should have come formally from the Minister of Defence, rather than as a sudden and unanimous inspiration of the Press.

Retaliatory Action
Mr. Begin made the most of this criticism of the present form of retaliatory action, to judge by the supreme contempt with which he blamed the present governmental policies for their errors. One might have thought that Herut alone had recognized the problem, and not that the newspapers of all the Coalition parties had said the same and more. Mr. Bernstein of the General Zionists brought it up again, and so did Mr. Argov, of Mafsi itself. Where retaliation was being so much reviled as costly and not capable of stopping infiltrations in

Arab countries where lives are not held over death, only Mr. Galili, the Abud Ha'avoda leader, contrived to bring back a sense of proportion. Mr. Begin had wanted against punitive actions, he said, claiming that punishment rarely changed a person, and never a nation. But how would he have reacted had anyone attacked him in the past two days later, and in which the General Zionists so conspicuously allied themselves with the Prime Minister's security policy. The debate was sober and substantial, and for once the members appeared to be genuinely talking to each other, and not solely to the gallery — though they had a good audience there throughout the three sessions.

Much of the talk throughout the debate — apart from the speech of the Prime Minister himself, was coloured by the aftermath of the Kalkiya attack. A day or so after this fight the entire Israeli press, again with the exception of the Communists, who are increasingly beginning to occupy a chimerical Laputan island of their own, with little contact with Israel reality, discussed the difficulties of the Kalkiya action with what was plainly well-founded information and total unanimity of view, from right to left. In essence the criticism was that Israel's retaliatory action had become routine, and therefore easier for the Jordanians to ward off, or at least to exact a greater cost in Israeli lives, and that it was not possible to fight retaliatory actions while observing tactical regulations and restrictions more appropriate to war games. Some realization of these facts had earlier begun to make itself felt, but it had never been given such outspoken form.

Even on this occasion there were some observers who doubted the wisdom of discussing military difficulties in plain view of the Egyptian and Jordan General Staffs, so to speak, or who thought that if it was time to air these matters, which are hardly subjects on which the general public can form a useful opinion, then they should have come formally from the Minister of Defence, rather than as a sudden and unanimous inspiration of the Press.

Retaliatory Action
Mr. Begin made the most of this criticism of the present form of retaliatory action, to judge by the supreme contempt with which he blamed the present governmental policies for their errors. One might have thought that Herut alone had recognized the problem, and not that the newspapers of all the Coalition parties had said the same and more. Mr. Bernstein of the General Zionists brought it up again, and so did Mr. Argov, of Mafsi itself. Where retaliation was being so much reviled as costly and not capable of stopping infiltrations in

Arab countries where lives are not held over death, only Mr. Galili, the Abud Ha'avoda leader, contrived to bring back a sense of proportion. Mr. Begin had wanted against punitive actions, he said, claiming that punishment rarely changed a person, and never a nation. But how would he have reacted had anyone attacked him in the past two days later, and in which the General Zionists so conspicuously allied themselves with the Prime Minister's security policy. The debate was sober and substantial, and for once the members appeared to be genuinely talking to each other, and not solely to the gallery — though they had a good audience there throughout the three sessions.

Much of the talk throughout the debate — apart from the speech of the Prime Minister himself, was coloured by the aftermath of the Kalkiya attack. A day or so after this fight the entire Israeli press, again with the exception of the Communists, who are increasingly beginning to occupy a chimerical Laputan island of their own, with little contact with Israel reality, discussed the difficulties of the Kalkiya action with what was plainly well-founded information and total unanimity of view, from right to left. In essence the criticism was that Israel's retaliatory action had become routine, and therefore easier for the Jordanians to ward off, or at least to exact a greater cost in Israeli lives, and that it was not possible to fight retaliatory actions while observing tactical regulations and restrictions more appropriate to war games. Some realization of these facts had earlier begun to make itself felt, but it had never been given such outspoken form.

Even on this occasion there were some observers who doubted the wisdom of discussing military difficulties in plain view of the Egyptian and Jordan General Staffs, so to speak, or who thought that if it was time to air these matters, which are hardly subjects on which the general public can form a useful opinion, then they should have come formally from the Minister of Defence, rather than as a sudden and unanimous inspiration of the Press.

Retaliatory Action
Mr. Begin made the most of this criticism of the present form of retaliatory action, to judge by the supreme contempt with which he blamed the present governmental policies for their errors. One might have thought that Herut alone had recognized the problem, and not that the newspapers of all the Coalition parties had said the same and more. Mr. Bernstein of the General Zionists brought it up again, and so did Mr. Argov, of Mafsi itself. Where retaliation was being so much reviled as costly and not capable of stopping infiltrations in

Arab countries where lives are not held over death, only Mr. Galili, the Abud Ha'avoda leader, contrived to bring back a sense of proportion. Mr. Begin had wanted against punitive actions, he said, claiming that punishment rarely changed a person, and never a nation. But how would he have reacted had anyone attacked him in the past two days later, and in which the General Zionists so conspicuously allied themselves with the Prime Minister's security policy. The debate was sober and substantial, and for once the members appeared to be genuinely talking to each other, and not solely to the gallery — though they had a good audience there throughout the three sessions.

Much of the talk throughout the debate — apart from the speech of the Prime Minister himself, was coloured by the aftermath of the Kalkiya attack. A day or so after this fight the entire Israeli press, again with the exception of the Communists, who are increasingly beginning to occupy a chimerical Laputan island of their own, with little contact with Israel reality, discussed the difficulties of the Kalkiya action with what was plainly well-founded information and total unanimity of view, from right to left. In essence the criticism was that Israel's retaliatory action had become routine, and therefore easier for the Jordanians to ward off, or at least to exact a greater cost in Israeli lives, and that it was not possible to fight retaliatory actions while observing tactical regulations and restrictions more appropriate to war games. Some realization of these facts had earlier begun to make itself felt, but it had never been given such outspoken form.

Even on this occasion there were some observers who doubted the wisdom of discussing military difficulties in plain view of the Egyptian and Jordan General Staffs, so to speak, or who thought that if it was time to air these matters, which are hardly subjects on which the general public can form a useful opinion, then they should have come formally from the Minister of Defence, rather than as a sudden and unanimous inspiration of the Press.

Retaliatory Action
Mr. Begin made the most of this criticism of the present form of retaliatory action, to judge by the supreme contempt with which he blamed the present governmental policies for their errors. One might have thought that Herut alone had recognized the problem, and not that the newspapers of all the Coalition parties had said the same and more. Mr. Bernstein of the General Zionists brought it up again, and so did Mr. Argov, of Mafsi itself. Where retaliation was being so much reviled as costly and not capable of stopping infiltrations in

Arab countries where lives are not held over death, only Mr. Galili, the Abud Ha'avoda leader, contrived to bring back a sense of proportion. Mr. Begin had wanted against punitive actions, he said, claiming that punishment rarely changed a person, and never a nation. But how would he have reacted had anyone attacked him in the past two days later, and in which the General Zionists so conspicuously allied themselves with the Prime Minister's security policy. The debate was sober and substantial, and for once the members appeared to be genuinely talking to each other, and not solely to the gallery — though they had a good audience there throughout the three sessions.

Much of the talk throughout the debate — apart from the speech of the Prime Minister himself, was coloured by the aftermath of the Kalkiya attack. A day or so after this fight the entire Israeli press, again with the exception of the Communists, who are increasingly beginning to occupy a chimerical Laputan island of their own, with little contact with Israel reality, discussed the difficulties of the Kalkiya action with what was plainly well-founded information and total unanimity of view, from right to left. In essence the criticism was that Israel's retaliatory action had become routine, and therefore easier for the Jordanians to ward off, or at least to exact a greater cost in Israeli lives, and that it was not possible to fight retaliatory actions while observing tactical regulations and restrictions more appropriate to war games. Some realization of these facts had earlier begun to make itself felt, but it had never been given such outspoken form.

Even on this occasion there were some observers who doubted the wisdom of discussing military difficulties in plain view of the Egyptian and Jordan General Staffs, so to speak, or who thought that if it was time to air these matters, which are hardly subjects on which the general public can form a useful opinion, then they should have come formally from the Minister of Defence, rather than as a sudden and unanimous inspiration of the Press.

Retaliatory Action
Mr. Begin made the most of this criticism of the present form of retaliatory action, to judge by the supreme contempt with which he blamed the present governmental policies for their errors. One might have thought that Herut alone had recognized the problem, and not that the newspapers of all the Coalition parties had said the same and more. Mr. Bernstein of the General Zionists brought it up again, and so did Mr. Argov, of Mafsi itself. Where retaliation was being so much reviled as costly and not capable of stopping infiltrations in

Arab countries where lives are not held over death, only Mr. Galili, the Abud Ha'avoda leader, contrived to bring back a sense of proportion. Mr. Begin had wanted against punitive actions, he said, claiming that punishment rarely changed a person, and never a nation. But how would he have reacted had anyone attacked him in the past two days later, and in which the General Zionists so conspicuously allied themselves with the Prime Minister's security policy. The debate was sober and substantial, and for once the members appeared to be genuinely talking to each other, and not solely to the gallery — though they had a good audience there throughout the three sessions.

from his position. If Mr. Dulles is genuinely anxious about Israel's supposed aggressiveness, he should study this sharp definition carefully, and draw his conclusions from it. They will not lead him astray.

Altman's Poem
NOT only did Mr. Ben-Gurion deliver a lengthy poem in his first speech (which was reproduced in this paper's Friday issue) but he told a Chinese story the second time he mounted the rostrum. It was a continuation of his debate with Mr. Begin, who despite his comparatively small Knesset showing, claims that "the people" have spoken in his favour, and is organising a kind of whispering campaign that he is the next prime minister. Who should be elected to guide the people, asks the Chinese sage, he whom everybody loves? Not necessarily, comes the answer. He whom everybody hates, then? Heaven forbid by no means. Who then? He whom the good love and the evil hate. Simple but pleasing.

Newsweek
THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS MAGAZINE
Issue: October 22
The Drift of the Red Satellites
Israel: The Girl Who Sighed
Price: 350 pruta
Obtainable everywhere

Magazine Column
Hearst Publications
NOW ON SALE
HARPER'S BAZAAR
September (Fall) issue
COSMOPOLITAN Sept.
Two Complete Short Novels
How and When to Have an Affair
New Drugs to Make you Relax
Is There a Potentially Dangerous Crackpot in Your Neighbourhood?
GOOD HOUSEKEEPING
October (Fall) issue
BUTTERICK (Fall)
Obtainable everywhere
Distributed by Steimatzky's Agency
Jerusalem • Tel Aviv • Haifa

Magazine Column
Hearst Publications
NOW ON SALE
HARPER'S BAZAAR
September (Fall) issue
COSMOPOLITAN Sept.
Two Complete Short Novels
How and When to Have an Affair
New Drugs to Make you Relax
Is There a Potentially Dangerous Crackpot in Your Neighbourhood?
GOOD HOUSEKEEPING
October (Fall) issue
BUTTERICK (Fall)
Obtainable everywhere
Distributed by Steimatzky's Agency
Jerusalem • Tel Aviv • Haifa

Magazine Column
Hearst Publications
NOW ON SALE
HARPER'S BAZAAR
September (Fall) issue
COSMOPOLITAN Sept.
Two Complete Short Novels
How and When to Have an Affair
New Drugs to Make you Relax
Is There a Potentially Dangerous Crackpot in Your Neighbourhood?
GOOD HOUSEKEEPING
October (Fall) issue
BUTTERICK (Fall)
Obtainable everywhere
Distributed by Steimatzky's Agency
Jerusalem • Tel Aviv • Haifa

Magazine Column
Hearst Publications
NOW ON SALE
HARPER'S BAZAAR
September (Fall) issue
COSMOPOLITAN Sept.
Two Complete Short Novels
How and When to Have an Affair
New Drugs to Make you Relax
Is There a Potentially Dangerous Crackpot in Your Neighbourhood?
GOOD HOUSEKEEPING
October (Fall) issue
BUTTERICK (Fall)
Obtainable everywhere
Distributed by Steimatzky's Agency
Jerusalem • Tel Aviv • Haifa

Magazine Column
Hearst Publications
NOW ON SALE
HARPER'S BAZAAR
September (Fall) issue
COSMOPOLITAN Sept.
Two Complete Short Novels
How and When to Have an Affair
New Drugs to Make you Relax
Is There a Potentially Dangerous Crackpot in Your Neighbourhood?
GOOD HOUSEKEEPING
October (Fall) issue
BUTTERICK (Fall)
Obtainable everywhere
Distributed by Steimatzky's Agency
Jerusalem • Tel Aviv • Haifa

Magazine Column
Hearst Publications
NOW ON SALE
HARPER'S BAZAAR
September (Fall) issue
COSMOPOLITAN Sept.
Two Complete Short Novels
How and When to Have an Affair
New Drugs to Make you Relax
Is There a Potentially Dangerous Crackpot in Your Neighbourhood?
GOOD HOUSEKEEPING
October (Fall) issue
BUTTERICK (Fall)
Obtainable everywhere
Distributed by Steimatzky's Agency
Jerusalem • Tel Aviv • Haifa

Magazine Column
Hearst Publications
NOW ON SALE
HARPER'S BAZAAR
September (Fall) issue
COSMOPOLITAN Sept.
Two Complete Short Novels
How and When to Have an Affair
New Drugs to Make you Relax
Is There a Potentially Dangerous Crackpot in Your Neighbourhood?
GOOD HOUSEKEEPING
October (Fall) issue
BUTTERICK (Fall)
Obtainable everywhere
Distributed by Steimatzky's Agency
Jerusalem • Tel Aviv • Haifa

Magazine Column
Hearst Publications
NOW ON SALE
HARPER'S BAZAAR
September (Fall) issue
COSMOPOLITAN Sept.
Two Complete Short Novels
How and When to Have an Affair
New Drugs to Make you Relax
Is There a Potentially Dangerous Crackpot in Your Neighbourhood?
GOOD HOUSEKEEPING
October (Fall) issue
BUTTERICK (Fall)
Obtainable everywhere
Distributed by Steimatzky's Agency
Jerusalem • Tel Aviv • Haifa

Magazine Column
Hearst Publications
NOW ON SALE
HARPER'S BAZAAR
September (Fall) issue
COSMOPOLITAN Sept.
Two Complete Short Novels
How and When to Have an Affair